

REMARKS

The present communication is filed in response to the Official Action mailed March 8, 2007, rejecting all the claims presently pending in the application. A petition for a three-month extension of time is submitted herewith.

Independent claims 1, 10-11, and 21, have been amended for clarification. Dependent claims 22-42 have been added. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-42 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 6,199,111 to Humpleman et al. ("*Humpleman*").

Claim 1, as amended, recites "receiving a first program inputted to said first device from the outside via content distribution" and "executing the first program to control said first device and initiate a second program prepared beforehand in said first device."

Humpleman does not disclose receiving a first program via content distribution. Rather, *Humpleman* merely discloses that a session manager may send control information to a tuner to broadcast a TV show, and may also send control information to a display to display the TV show. *Humpleman*, Col. 14, lines 34-39. *Humpleman* nowhere mentions inputting a program via content distribution.

Humpleman further fails to disclose executing the first program to initiate a second program prepared beforehand in said first device. Rather, *Humpleman* describes that the session manager sends information to the first device and to the second device. See *id.* There is no mention that a program input to and executed by a first device initiates a program already installed on the second device.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that *Humpleman* does not disclose "receiving a first program inputted to said first device from the outside via content distribution" and "executing the first program to control said first device and initiate a second program prepared beforehand in said first device" as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over *Humpleman*. Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Because claims 2-9 depend from claim 1, and thus include all the limitations therof, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-9 is also requested.

Independent claims 10, 11, and 21 were rejected on the same grounds as claim 1. Claims 10, 11, and 21 have been amended to include limitations similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 10, 11, and 21 are patentable over *Humpleman* for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 10, 11, and 21 be withdrawn. Because claims 12-20 depend from and include all the limitations of claim 11, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 12-20 is further requested.

Each of new claims 22-42 depends from one of the independent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with the independent claims, claims 22-42 are patentable.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action

can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: September 6, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Natalie S. Morelli

Registration No.: 58,545
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMLOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

747141_1.DOC